

United States District Court, Eastern District of Washington
Magistrate Judge Mary K. Dimke
Richland

**USA v. JESE DAVID CARILLO
CASILLAS**

Case No. 4:15-CR-6049-EFS-2

**Defendant's Motion to Re-open Detention Hearing
(ECF 568):**

11/27/2017

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pam Howard, Courtroom Deputy [Y/Tele] | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Stephanie Van Marter, US Atty [S/Video] |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cora Vargas, Courtroom Deputy [R] | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Robin Emmans, Defense Atty [R] |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Erica Helms, US Probation / Pretrial Services [T/Tele], and Janie Coronado [R] | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Interpreter – Steve Muzik [R] |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Defendant present <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> in custody USM | <input type="checkbox"/> Defendant not present / failed to appear |
| <input type="checkbox"/> out of custody | |
| <hr/> | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Defendant continued detained | <input type="checkbox"/> Conditions of Release imposed |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> 199C Advice of Penalties/Sanctions |

REMARKS

Defense counsel argued why there are conditions which justify reconsidering the issues of detention and that such conditions will reasonably assure Defendant's appearance as required.

Testifying for Defense: Jese David Carillo Casillas. Jese David Carillo Casillas was sworn in and testified with the assistance of the interpreter.

Direct examination by Defense.

Cross examination by USA.

Witness excused by the Court at 11:46 a.m.

Testifying for Defense: Daisy Camacho. Daisy Camacho was sworn in and testified.

Court colloquy with counsel regarding 5th amendment rights of this witness. USA advises Defendant would have those issues in its line of questioning.

The Court excuses this witness 11:50 a.m.

Defense proffers to the Court as to Defendant's proposed residence. Court colloquy with Defense regarding Defendant's medical issues. Defense argues Defendant could get better nutrition if released versus in custody. Defense proposes conditions of release.

Government proffered the pretrial services reports. Government argued that there are no conditions which justify reconsidering the issues of detention or that there are no conditions which will reasonably assure Defendant's appearance as required and/or the safety of the community.

Defense presents rebuttal argument.

The Court ordered:

1. Defendant's Motion to Re-open Detention (ECF 568) is **denied**.

2. The Court ruled Defendant's medical needs and personal safety are being addressed by the U. S. Marshal's.
3. The Court ruled that it will abide by its earlier detention determination. Defendant's proposed release plan is not appropriate.
4. Defendant shall be detained by the U.S. Marshal until further order of the Court and they shall ensure Defendant is receiving adequate nutrition.